

Amend Section 601,  
Title 14, California Code of Regulations  
Re: Shooting Clubs: Enhancement and Management of Fish and Wildlife  
and their Habitat on Private Lands

- 1-

The proposal would make minor editorial changes from old subsection references to new section and subsection 708 numbers.

(b) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation:

Authority: Sections 200, 202, 203, 3402, 3404, and 3406, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 3400-3404, 3406-3409, 4331-4332, and 4341, Fish and Game Code.

(c) Specific Technology or Equipment Required by Regulatory Change: None.

(d) Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change:

2002 Draft Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

(e) Public Discussions of Proposed Regulations Prior to Notice Publication:

In 2000, the Department held a total of twenty-three (23) "Deer Stakeholder" meetings throughout the state. The meetings were open to the public, and the Department provided information on a variety of deer management strategies and issues including: Deer Assessment Unit (zone complex) planning and tag draw method alternatives. Attendees were asked to participate in a survey and public comment was also received. The dates and locations of these meetings were as follows:

July 24, 2000 - Chico  
July 25, 2000 - Modesto  
July 26, 2000 - Fresno  
July 27, 2000 - Bakersfield  
August 9, 2000 - Folsom  
August 10, 2000 - Truckee  
August 22, 2000 - Bishop  
August 23, 2000 - Long Beach  
August 24, 2000 - El Cajon  
September 12, 2000 - Santa Barbara  
September 28, 2000 - Salinas  
October 17, 2000 - Eureka  
October 18, 2000 - Red Bluff  
October 19, 2000 - Susanville  
October 20, 2000 - Redding  
October 23, 2000 - Alturas  
November 1, 2000 - Rohnert Park

November 14, 2000 - Yreka  
November 16, 2000 - Merced

November 21, 2000 - Arroyo Grande  
December 7, 2000 - Livermore  
December 11, 2000 - El Centro  
December 14, 2000 - Redlands

In addition, the Department conducted four public meetings in which regulation change concepts and specific proposals for mammals and furbearers, including deer were presented and discussed, and additional public comment was received. The dates and locations of these meetings were as follows:

November 7, 2001 in Fresno  
November 13, 2001 in San Diego  
November 29, 2001 in Monterey  
December 13, 2001 in Sacramento

#### IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

##### (a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

There is no reasonable alternative to the proposed action.

##### (b) No Change Alternative:

The no change alternative was considered and found inadequate to attain the project objectives. Current proposals would delete and move various administrative sections and subsections into a new single Section 708. The no change alternative would result in inconsistencies in section and subsection references and lead to confusion.

##### (c) Consideration of Alternatives:

In view of information currently possessed, no reasonable alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purposes for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to the affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

#### V. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action:

The proposed regulatory action will have no negative impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

## VI. Impact of Regulatory Action:

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made.

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businessmen to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. Given the number of tags available and the area over which they are distributed, these proposals are economically neutral to business.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.
- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business: The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.
- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

## INFORMATIVE DIGEST (Policy Statement Overview)

Existing regulations provide for hunting big game species on Private Lands Management Areas licensed by the Commission under Section 601. Within Section 601, references are made to other sections and subsections regarding various big game license tag administrative procedures and requirements. Several of these referenced subsections, are currently proposed for deletion and incorporation into a new Section 708 titled, Big Game License Tag, Application, Distribution and Reporting Procedures. For consistency in regulation, the proposal would make minor editorial changes to reference new section and subsection 708 numbers.